

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
9 January 1964

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: Members - William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
Aline Saarinen
John Carl Warnecke

Staff - L. R. Wilson, Secretary
C.H. Atherton, Asst. Secy
C.L. Martin, Counsel
Myra Younker, Editor
Leone Vialpando, Recorder

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Licenses & Inspections

/ Watergate Development - Conference with Architect & Project Representatives

Professor Luigi Moretti, architect, Dr. Aldo Samaritani, Director, Societe Generale Immobiliare, and representatives of the Watergate Development Corporation met with the Commission.

Dr. Samaritani stated that since the November 20th meeting the architect and developers had attempted to reconcile the requirements set forth by the Commission with those established by the District of Columbia, and, except for Building No. 2, all planning for the project was in line with the Commission's conditions for approval.

Professor Moretti stated one change from the plans considered by the Commission on the previous day had been agreed upon. This was the removal of one penthouse level on the northeast corner of Building No. 1. No changes to the design of Building No. 2 were proposed, and retention of the seven villas near this building was contemplated. He concluded his remarks by stating that he believed the project would meet the Commission's requirements by virtue of the proposed design changes in Building Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the fact that Building No. 2 is "furthest away from Rock Creek Parkway." New samples of concrete aggregates were displayed which were intended to meet the Commission's recommendation that warmer tones be used.

In executive session the members discussed the presentation and reaffirmed

their conclusion of the previous day that the developers had not made changes which complied with the plan that the Commission had indicated it would approve - a uniform maximum building height of 140 feet above water level plus one penthouse level. It was agreed that the Commission should stand on the terms of this standard and refuse to accept any proposal to make changes in future buildings in exchange for acceptance of no changes in Building No. 2.

The Chairman announced the unanimous decision of the Commission to the developers.

Mr. Salgo asked if the changes proposed in the buildings other than Building No. 2 conformed to the Commission's requirements. The Chairman replied that the only vote taken related to Building No. 2; that the Commission would not comment on future building for which detailed presentations had not been made, and that the Commission's position had been clearly stated in its letter of 20 November 1963 to the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections.

A similar reply was given to a request for the Commission's comment on a possible arrangement whereby the District Government would agree to a paper transfer of the equivalent of one floor from Building No. 2 to Building No. 1 with the understanding that the Commission of Fine Arts would not approve the added height in Building No. 1 and the District Government would eliminate it at the time a permit application was filed.

The Commission members did not comment on Mr. Salgo's remark that the cornice line shown on the drawings was at 143 feet, nor was any comment made on the samples of building materials presented.

The transcript of that portion of the discussion following the executive session is EXHIBIT A.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Federal Office Building No. 5 - Conference with National Capital Planning Commission

The conference was held with members of the Planning Commission, Mr. Karel Yasko and Mr. Robert Daly of the Public Buildings Service, and Mr. Nathaniel Curtis representing the architects, present.

Using a scale model and blocks to represent the building masses, Mr. Yasko explained the proposal which the Commission of Fine Arts had recommended on the previous day. In his explanation Mr. Yasko added that a structure, possibly a one-story cafeteria with a garden, had been proposed by the architects on the southwest quadrant of the site. He pointed out that the Public Buildings Service had accepted this concept in principle,

subject to further studies as to the details.

The members of the Planning Commission thereafter voted to approve the design concept as proposed.

The transcript of the joint meeting is EXHIBIT B.

Thereupon, at 3:00 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "C. L. Martin". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly stylized script.

C.L. Martin, Counsel

METTING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

9 January 1964

AM

9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

9:35 1. Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Watergate Development - Conference with Luigi Moretti, architect, and other representatives of the project.

11:00 b. S.L. 64-50, Apartment House, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W.

(Mr. J. P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits; Mr. J. B. Shapiro, builder; Mr. Walter Bucher, architect)

2:30 2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Federal Office Building No. 5 - Conference with National Capital Planning Commission

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE LAND OFFICE FOR THE YEAR 1890

LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

1890
5000

LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

17

LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

1890
5000

1. LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

1890
5000

2. LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

1890
5000

3. LANDS BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT

Cultural Center isn't new.

MR. KELLY: We went as far as we could possibly go.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I mean it's just old arguments.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we've said it a hundred times.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think it says it marvellously in the letter that you wrote. That's just it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You see, they're afraid of that Lincoln Memorial line, too. That is the burden of these photographs.

MR. BUNSHAFT: These photographs are a joke. They don't prove anything.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Of course not.

All right, Mr. Atherton, they might as well come in.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Is this Kennedy Cultural Center coming before this Commission?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Of course.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we ought to do something about not having another stone building coming in there. Well -- that's a long way off.

(Professor Moretti and his company re-entered the Conference Room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gentlemen, at our November meeting we offered to in the future approve a presentation that would

Exhibit A

be 140 feet above the water level, plus one penthouse story on building No. 2.

You have not conformed with or made any concession toward meeting these terms. Our position remains unchanged. We rejected Building No. 2 before. It isn't up before us formally today. Our position, if it were presented, would be identical. We have stated, as a matter of public policy, that we wish to protect the skyline of the river, to maintain the Lincoln Memorial as the dominant architectural element. We feel very strongly about it. We feel that the city and the nation feel very strongly about it.

To discuss slight modifications in future buildings is neither here nor there. It is only Building No. 2 that is under consideration today, and the Commission is completely united in this position.

Thank you for coming.

MR. SALGO: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the privilege of asking the following question: As far as we are concerned, you want to have a complete aspect of our overall problem. We now find you want to concern yourself essentially with Building No. 2.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't quite understand what you mean.

MR. SALGO: Our efforts and discussion with the

District has been to try to synchronize your desire on Building No. 2 and the rest of the project.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. SALGO: Unfortunately, there is some legal quirk in the matter that it is all one building from one side; and at the same time, it's a separate building on other sides. In other words, as far as obligation to build at a certain height, and so forth. As far as a building permit is concerned, we are now before you only for Building No. 2. I tried to get this clarification because all of our efforts were to abolish the obligation to go on Building No. 1 effectively two more floors higher than you suggested.

May I ask you this question with respect to your opinion: Do we conform today in our other buildings as presented, to your desire?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have not taken any action on any future buildings whatsoever.

MR. SALGO: I understand that, legally speaking, but I would --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is the only way I can speak to you. As you well know, we are at this moment making a legal record, and we will stick very close to it.

MR. SALGO: All right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I can't give you any opinions on

things for which detailed presentations have not been made, or the Commission has taken a vote. We have taken a vote on Building No. 2.

MR. SALGO: Building No. 2?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Correct.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think, Bill, what we're saying is we are sticking by the letter that Mr. Walton wrote, and that covers the entire project, 140 feet. Period. Plus one penthouse. That's what the letter says, and there is no use confusing the issue.

MR. SALGO: I'm not trying to confuse, but to clarify it for ourselves, because if we had yesterday again -- believe me, we did everything in our power to come back today with a plan which is exactly what you wanted, because you know that we, as you, are concerned with starting to build Building No. 2. Frankly, we're not so much concerned about what happens to this building (indicating), which is 30 years ahead of us, and economy and otherwise is subject to whatever happens in the next four years.

At the last minute yesterday came up this idea which was considered, which cast what is called a "legal playing on words," but anyhow, which may be acceptable to -- though we have no assurance whatever that we could, at least for planning

and Article 75 purposes, take the last floor which is your objection, if I understand here, the second floor up from the parapet.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Correct; we have made it very clear and very specific.

MR. SALGO: Right here (indicating), until which, until yesterday at five minutes before four, the District would not want to listen. At four o'clock, they said, "All right; your idea to take this and put it over there (indicating on model) may be acceptable for you to get a building permit, although we know that the Fine Arts Commission will never give you a permit to put it over there, in effect, but since that is four years ahead in the meantime, you can go ahead."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But you do know exactly where we stand.

MR. SALGO: Yes, but you have to give us also a little bit of credit in this way, that we have to fit practically between two walls, and it's awfully hard to look over them. Our question to you is if we get from the Zoning Board a waiver so we can get down --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have stated in this letter that we would approve such a building. We made it exactly specific.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Not by increasing the other ones.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No. No, we're not entering into any deals on any future buildings.

MR. SALGO: That's all I am asking you. You see, there's where the legal fallacy of the whole thing is. They would accept today to transfer it over here (indicating), though they know absolutely that you will never approve it but in the meantime they will give us a permit, and when they get down there they'll cut it back. It's crazy but we can't help it.

MRS. SAARINEN: But we have been absolutely consistent so you are not boxed in by us. We made it clear; our letter applies to the whole project.

MR. SALGO: All I'm asking you is to take notice that they gave us a chance that they may permit it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, we take notice and what you have said is written in our record.

MR. SALGO: There is one of many questions, if they will do it for us; I don't know. There was a faint hope yesterday. Our cornice line as now designed, starting from the level where deeper we cannot go because of water condition, is not exactly the 140 that you gave us. But if you remark on the documentation, it's 143.

MR. WARNECKE: What are you asking for now?

MR. SALGO: I'm asking you the question, can we maintain --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Look; we've compromised every inch all the way to try to make it possible for you to build this. We can go no further than the terms of this letter.

MR. FISCHER: Let me say this, if I may clarify this for a moment. The requirements of the building itself, we have the minimum eight feet that the District requires throughout. We have actually on the first ground floor level twelve feet, which is an absolutely minimum because we have to get a decent lobby and shops in there.

Our other limitation is the fact we are at water level where we have to start going into the ground, and if we go into the ground further at a considerable amount of cost -- so this is how we arrive in what actually amounts to, in terms of total top, 2-1/2 feet. We are not asking for a ten-foot parapet but nine feet, you see. This then gives us the 2-1/2 feet we required in order to be able to proceed on this basis; otherwise, it really means the elimination of one more complete floor in addition to eliminating this top floor.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have nothing to say on this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We will stick by that letter.

MR. WARNECKE: You could work it down to 140.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Alas! We have other business we must go on with. Thank you very much for coming.

(Professor Moretti and his group withdrew from the Conference Room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any small items you want to take care of?

Does anyone have any deep philosophical problems they want to bring up in the next fifteen minutes?

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are we going to do with the \$70,000?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Equipment and display materials, and make this room much more useable.

MR. BUNSHAFT: ~~Wouldn't~~ Wouldn't the first thing be to get a good map or model of Washington, so we know what we are talking about?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That would be a long-range item, but don't you think a drawing like the Pennsylvania Avenue drawing would be helpful?

MR. KELLY: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How large a map of the City of Washington?

MR. KELLY: There's one that this Commission owns, made back in 1900.

MRS. SAARINEN: Would it be possible, whether it's a

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

JAN 21 1964

NOTED _____

fw

Ch
JH

ITEM 3. FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NO. 5, SOUTHWEST URBAN RENEWAL
AREA

Mrs. J. H. Rowe, Jr.

(JOINT MEETING WITH THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS)

Capital Planning Commission CHAIRMAN ROWE: We have these fine seats here for
you. I tried to pass the gavel to the Chairman of the Fine
Arts Commission. He says that he is not on his home territory;
that I should keep the gavel and when we come to your home
territory, he will take it.

EXHIBIT B

I think it might be a good idea to go around the table and have everybody introduce themselves rather than our trying to introduce each person to the others.

MR. KELLY: I am Burnham Kelly.

GENERAL DUKE: Tell us who you are.

MR. KELLY: Fine Arts Commission, Cornell University.

MR. BUNDSHAFT: Gordon Bundshaft, Fine Arts Commission, Architect.

GENERAL DUKE: Charles Duke, Planning Commission.

MR. THIRY: Paul Thiry, Architect, Planning Commission.

MR. WOODRUFF: A.M. Woodruff, Vice Chairman, Planning Commission. Mr. Kelly is Vice Chairman of his Commission.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: I am Elizabeth Rowe. I am Chairman of the Planning Commission.

MR. WALTON: I am Bill Walton, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission.

MR. NORTON: I am McKim Norton, Architect; Planning Commission.

MR. JETT: T. Sutton Jett, National Park Service.

MR. DALY: Robert Daly, Commissioner of Public Buildings.

MR. BARNETT: Joe Barnett, representing the Bureau of Public Roads on the Planning Commission.

MR. RANNELLS: John Rannels, representing the

National Capital Transportation Agency.

MR. ZACH: Leon Zach, representing the Chief of Engineers.

MR. ROSZAK: Theodore Roszak, Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. WARNECKE: John Warnecke, Architect.

MRS. SAARINEN: Aline Saarinen, Commission of Fine Arts, layman.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: I am so pleased to see you, Mrs. Saarinen. I am a layman, too.

I think we come together today to see the line up of Federal Office Building No. 5, in the Southwest Urban Renewal Area.

Do you want to review the history?

MR. WALTON: I don't think that is necessary.

MR. YASKO: We will dispense with the history.

It will be pertinent to review one aspect of this to put this in focus, that is the basic part of the scheme which we have been working. I hope you can see this (referring to model). This is a building that had the main structure on the Avenue, on stilts, then two wing buildings in the back along the wall following that passageway.

We at the Fine Arts Commission have had various types of situations. What has come out of it, at the suggestion of the Fine Arts Commission, is basically the same

scheme in which we would maintain a similar building along the Avenue, and in lieu of the two parallel low structures on each side of the wall, concentrate a solid mass in this side(indicating), which is the larger part of this site.

As you know, there is a bend in here. There is a greater piece of land in here. We would maintain that as a solid building to the ground, and this building would remain on stilts, its concept not changing. This was the basic concept that we used as a guide line.

We have been meeting with our architects on this, accepting this as a guideline suggestion that we are thinking in terms of, because this is going to be something we bring you here to show you what has happened and we have further instructions. Unfortunately, a block of wood like this was lost between the office and here. That went where these coins are, not where the beams are. There might be a smaller structure in this area which might be the cafeteria and auditorium aspect of this, which could be connected with a light glass passage here, parking underground here(indicating), concentrating direct office facilities in these masses, this being lower than this, this being higher, which would then maintain the same basic partie. If you look at it this way, we "fattened" this element, and made this element smaller(indicating).

I will say at this point that we are all in agreement on this at P.B. 5. Mr. Daly, the Commissioner, I assume I

Speak for you, Bob, it is our last one, that this is the scheme that maintained the spirit of the original partle, one we could live with and work with--this can do it.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Mr. Walton.

MR. WALTON: Well, he has represented our position very well.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: How does your Commission feel?

MR. WALTON: We are not discussing that third building where the pennies are?

MR. YASKO: No, that is true, the partle you see, we had this element here. This is something that came up, in considering this element in here.

MR. DUTTON: Would you describe the shape?

MR. CURTIS: No, I couldn't. The thought came out that this could be a one-story element.

MR. WALTON: It removes our worry that it might be a parking lot, if there is no development in there. I would like to see something on that spot.

MRS. SAARINEN: A garden?

MR. CURTIS: If this was a cafeteria, and we had a concentration at noon, with a garden here, this could spill out in a land-scaped area.

MR. WALTON: That will automatically relieve our fear, if the land is used. If you leave it unused, you will see what will happen.

MR. YASKO: If you separate it out of the basic building, it can be used nights. We feel the environment then could be extremely attractive in the view. It is a gem of a building, not solid anywhere, modest yet sparkling.

MR. WALTON: It sounds very attractive to me.

MR. YASKO: Whereas this begins to tie in with these buildings, we have a little homogenous feeling of the solids, to take care of that space, competing here, helping to take care of this. We consider this has great validity and is still protecting the basic parts originally approved, which was this (indicating).

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Spanning the mall?

MR. WASKO: Spanning the mall. We reserve the right to make a final one after study, but on the broad principle. This is our position.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Are there any questions?

MR. WALTON: Mr. Warnecke was about to ask one.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Mr. Warnecke.

MR. WARNECKE: Is that an extra floor, two floors on the solid block?

MR. YASKO: No. This is just last night, Jack, just to get the elements in here. We had a block of wood. Our tools were limited. We had to do this overnight and set it in.

MRS. SAARINEN: Part of our thinking in suggesting this was it would relate both to the mall and make an end to

the street coming in there. In other words, that would be studied.

MR. YASKO: This is the big reservation. We are accepting the concept, but we will have to make studies for determination of the exact sizes and elements in it. That was something that last night we felt if we got blocks, that you would understand what the position was. These will require studies, just as columns under the big buildings, whether sixty or thirty of these reservations, they were studied to find the detail. Fundamentally, this is the basic partie.

MR. THIRY: I think this is within the framework of the original intent. It certainly is a very definite improvement. If the Fine Arts Commission is willing to settle for this, it looks good to me.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Maybe we ought to take a vote. Maybe we should have unanimity. As a Fine Arts Commission and Planning Commission, we have to do these things separately.

MR. WALTON: We have already taken ours.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Where is the General Counsel?

MR. SHEAR: Over here, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Could the Planning Commission take an action now?

MR. SHEAR: Yes, provided we don't have more hands raised than there are members.

MR. THIRY: In that case, I would like to move the

approval.

MR. ZACH: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: All those in favor, who are bona fide members of the Planning Commission, please signify by raising their hands.

(The members present raised their hands.)

CHAIRMAN ROWE: The motion carried unanimously. This is a great day.

MR. SHEAR: In order to be certain the record is clear, I assume the vote has been to approve the design concept, the previous design concept approved by the Commission and the Public Buildings. You are aware that you will have to return--

MR. YASKO: Very much so. There are reservations in the studies, there will be height changes, things of that sort. We don't want to be tied down, that this is going to be eight, five or six. This is going to be back to both bodies.

MR. SHEAR: I understand that. I want to be sure you do.

MR. BARNETT: Did the Architect favor this over the other?

MR. YASKO: They can speak for themselves.

MR. BARNETT: Were there any professionals assigned to this project, let's hear from them.

MR. YASKO: That this is the basic partle.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Would you like to talk?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Yasko has expressed our position very well.

MR. YASKO: I wasn't keeping him out. I wouldn't speak as I have spoken without their concurrence, completely.

MR. WALTON: The Commissioners who are making the 3:30 shuttle will be able to.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Thank you very much for coming. I think we ought to go as a joint body and hit the first demolition ball that hits those temporary buildings on Friday.

MR. WALTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ROWE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the Members of the Fine Arts Commission and their delegation left the hearing room.)

